

REMARKS

The Official Action dated March 26, 2007, has been carefully considered. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks presented herein.

Claims 1, 11, 15 and 21-22 are hereby amended, and claims 6-10 and 16-20 are hereby canceled. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification and drawings. It is believed that these amendments do not involve introduction of new matter, and entry is accordingly believed to be in order and is respectfully requested. Claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-25 and 27 remain in the present application and are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 11, 14-23, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (U.S. Patent No. 4,230,246) in view of Fukushima et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0052712). Claims 12, 13, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of Fukushima et al. and in further view of Sotiroff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,983). Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of Fukushima et al. and in further view of Pilliod (U.S. Patent No. 5,484,198). However, Applicants submit that the vehicles defined by claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-25 and 27 are not rendered obvious by any arguable combination of Wilson, Fukushima et al., Sotiroff et al., and Pilliod. Accordingly, these rejections are traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In contrast with the teachings of Wilson, Fukushima et al., Sotiroff et al., and Pilliod, independent claim 1 relates to a vehicle which includes, among other elements, a wheel which is rotatably attached to a first shell and cooperates with a bottom portion of a first shell

to therebetween receive a side section of a support member such that the wheel contacts the side section when the support member is at the first position for limiting movement of the support member with respect to the first shell in at least one direction substantially perpendicular to a movement path. In further contrast with the teachings of Wilson, Fukushima et al., Sotiroff et al., and Pilliod, independent claim 15 relates to a vehicle which includes, among other elements, a support member having a flange configured to selectively engage a first recessed region in a bottom portion of a first shell for substantially inhibiting sliding movement of the support member relative to the first shell along a movement path when the support member is at a first position, and the flange is further configured to selectively engage a second recessed region in a second shell for substantially inhibiting sliding movement of the support member relative to the first shell along the movement path when the support member is at a second position.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See MPEP 2143.03. Many such elements are not taught or suggested by any arguable combination of Wilson, Fukushima et al., Sotiroff et al., and Pilliod. For example, neither Wilson, Fukushima et al., Sotiroff et al., nor Pilliod, alone or in any arguable combination, teaches or suggests a vehicle which includes, among other elements, a wheel which is rotatably attached to a first shell and cooperates with a bottom portion of the first shell to therebetween receive a side section of a support member such that the wheel contacts the side section when the support member is at the first position for limiting movement of the support member with respect to the first shell in at least one direction substantially perpendicular to the movement path as recited, for example, by independent claim 1. An example of such an arrangement is illustrated in FIG. 4A of the present application. Accordingly, as elements of independent claim 1 are not taught or

suggested by any arguable combination of Wilson, Fukushima et al., Sotiroff et al., and Pilliod, Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be removed.

As another example, neither Wilson, Fukushima et al., Sotiroff et al., nor Pilliod, alone or in any arguable combination, teaches or suggests a vehicle which includes, among other elements, a support member having a flange configured to selectively engage a first recessed region in a bottom portion of a first shell for substantially inhibiting sliding movement of the support member relative to the first shell along a movement path when the support member is at a first position, wherein the flange is further configured to selectively engage a second recessed region in a second shell for substantially inhibiting sliding movement of the support member relative to the first shell along the movement path when the support member is at a second position as recited, for example, by independent claim 15. An example of such an arrangement is illustrated in FIGS. 6A-6B of the present application and, in this arrangement, the claimed flange can advantageously facilitate selective retention of the support member in both extended and retracted positions with respect to the first shell.

While the Official Action indicates that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace an alleged position locking mechanism (75/77/79) of Wilson with another alleged position locking mechanism (73) taught by Wilson, the Official Action fails to identify any adequate teaching, suggestion, or motivation to modify Wilson in the manner, and Applicants believe that no such teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claim 15 is improper and should be removed.


Furthermore, Applicants contend that it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have combined Wilson,

Fukushima et al., Sotiroff et al., and/or Pilliod as contended in the Official Action in an attempt to reach the present invention as described, for example, in independent claims 1 and 15. For example, Pilliod relates to a drawer guide assembly for drawers associated with furniture, and it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have combined Pilliod with Wilson and/or Fukushima et al. in an attempt to reach the vehicles respectively defined by independent claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, for this additional reason, Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are improper and should be removed.

The claims dependent upon independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable as being dependent upon allowable base claims, as well as for additional reasons. As such, allowance of dependent claims 2-5, 11-14, 21-25, and 27 is respectfully requested.

For the reasons set forth above and additional reasons not specifically recited herein, it is believed that the rejections have been overcome, and that claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-25 and 27 are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and early allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Eric M. Robbins
Registration No. 52,170
Attorney for Applicant
Ulmer & Berne LLP
Suite 2800
600 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 698-5148